

**Mar 01, 2019**

SEAN F. McAVOY, CLERK

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

SCOTT M.,<sup>1</sup>

Plaintiff,

v.

NANCY A. BERRYHILL, Commissioner  
of Social Security,

Defendant.

No. 4:18-CV-5005-EFS

**ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTION FOR SUMMARY  
JUDGMENT, DENYING  
DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR  
SUMMARY JUDGMENT, AND  
REMANDING**

**CLERK'S OFFICE ACTION  
REQUIRED**

Before the Court, without oral argument, are cross-summary-judgment motions, ECF Nos. 15 & 19. Plaintiff Scott M. appeals the Administrative Law Judge's (ALJ) denial of benefits.<sup>2</sup> Plaintiff contends the ALJ: (1) erred in rejecting the U.S. Department of Veteran Affairs' (VA) finding that Plaintiff was disabled; (2) improperly rejected the opinions of Plaintiff's medical care providers; (3) improperly rejected Plaintiff's impairments at step two; (4) improperly rejected lay witness testimony; (5) improperly rejected Plaintiff's subjective complaints; and

<sup>1</sup> To protect the privacy of social-security plaintiffs, the Court refers to them by first name and last initial. *See* LCivR 5.2(c). When quoting the Administrative Record in this order, the Court will substitute "Plaintiff" for any other identifier that was used.

<sup>2</sup> ECF No. 1.

1 (6) conducted an improper step five analysis.<sup>3</sup> The Commissioner of Social Security  
2 (“Commissioner”) asks the Court to affirm the ALJ’s decision. After reviewing the  
3 record and relevant authority, the Court is fully informed. For the reasons set forth  
4 below, the Court finds that the ALJ failed to provide persuasive, specific, valid  
5 reasons, supported by substantial evidence to reject the VA’s disability  
6 determination. Further, the Court cannot find that this was a harmless error.  
7 Accordingly, the Court grant’s Plaintiff’s Motion for Summary Judgment, denies the  
8 Commissioner’s Motion for Summary Judgment, and remands for further  
9 proceedings.  
10

### 11 I. Standard of Review

12 On review, the Court must uphold the ALJ’s determination that the claimant  
13 is not disabled if the ALJ applied the proper legal standards and there is substantial  
14 evidence in the record as a whole to support the decision.<sup>4</sup> “Substantial evidence  
15 means more than a mere scintilla, but less than a preponderance. It means such  
16 relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a  
17 conclusion.”<sup>5</sup> The Court will also uphold “such inferences and conclusions as the  
18 [ALJ] may reasonably draw from the evidence.”<sup>6</sup>  
19

20 In reviewing a denial of benefits, the Court considers the record as a whole,  
21 not just the evidence supporting the ALJ’s decision.<sup>7</sup> That said, the Court may not  
22

---

23 <sup>3</sup> ECF No. 15 at 5.

24 <sup>4</sup> *Delgado v. Heckler*, 722 F.2d 570, 572 (9th Cir. 1983) (citing 42 U.S.C. § 405(g)); *Browner v. Sec’y*  
25 *of Health & Human Servs.*, 839 F.2d 432, 433 (9th Cir. 1987).

26 <sup>5</sup> *Desrosiers v. Sec’y of Health & Human Servs.*, 846 F.2d 573, 576 (9th Cir. 1988) (citations and  
internal quotation marks omitted).

<sup>6</sup> *Mark v. Celebrezze*, 348 F.2d 289, 293 (9th Cir. 1965).

<sup>7</sup> *Weetman v. Sullivan*, 877 F.2d 20, 22 (9th Cir. 1989).

1 substitute its judgment for that of the Commissioner. If the evidence supports more  
2 than one rational interpretation, a reviewing court must uphold the ALJ's decision.<sup>8</sup>  
3 Further, the Court "may not reverse an ALJ's decision on account of an error that is  
4 harmless."<sup>9</sup> An error is harmless "where it is inconsequential to the [ALJ's] ultimate  
5 nondisability determination,"<sup>10</sup> and where the reviewing court "can confidently  
6 conclude that no reasonable ALJ, when fully crediting the testimony, could have  
7 reached a different disability determination."<sup>11</sup>  
8

## 9 **II. Facts, Procedural History, and the ALJ's Findings**<sup>12</sup>

10 Plaintiff Scott M. is 57 years old and lives in West Richland, Washington.  
11 Plaintiff filed an application for social security disability, dated September 1, 2013,  
12 alleging a disability onset date of May 18, 2012.<sup>13</sup> Plaintiff's claim was initially  
13 denied, and upon reconsideration, Plaintiff requested a hearing before an ALJ on  
14 July 24, 2014, which was held on March 22, 2016.<sup>14</sup> On June 27, 2016, the ALJ,  
15 Tom L. Morris, rendered a decision denying Plaintiff's claim.<sup>15</sup>  
16

17 At step one,<sup>16</sup> the ALJ found Plaintiff had not engaged in substantial gainful  
18 activity since May 18, 2012, the alleged onset date.<sup>17</sup>  
19

---

20  
21 <sup>8</sup> *Allen v. Heckler*, 749 F.2d 577, 579 (9th Cir. 1984).

<sup>9</sup> *Molina v. Astrue*, 674 F.3d 1104, 1111 (9th Cir. 2012).

<sup>10</sup> *Id.* at 1115 (quotations and citation omitted).

<sup>11</sup> *Marsh v. Colvin*, 792 F.3d 1170, 1173 (9th Cir. 2015) (citation omitted).

<sup>12</sup> The facts are only briefly summarized. Detailed facts are contained in the administrative hearing transcript, the ALJ's decision, and the parties' briefs.

<sup>13</sup> AR 22.

<sup>14</sup> *Id.*

<sup>15</sup> AR 37.

<sup>16</sup> The applicable five-step disability determination process is set forth in the ALJ's decision, AR 20–21, and the Court presumes the parties are well acquainted with that standard process. As such, the Court does not restate the five-step process in this order.

<sup>17</sup> AR 24.

1 At step two, the ALJ found Plaintiff had the following severe medical  
2 impairments: disorders of the gastrointestinal system/gastroesophageal reflux  
3 disorder (GERD); obesity; essential hyperextension; disorders [of] the muscles,  
4 ligaments, and fascia; affective disorder; and anxiety disorder.<sup>18</sup>

5  
6 At step three, the ALJ found that Plaintiff did not have an impairment that  
7 met the severity of a listed impairment.<sup>19</sup>

8 At step four, the ALJ found that Plaintiff had the residual functional capacity  
9 (RFC) to perform light work.<sup>20</sup> He found that Plaintiff can occasionally lift and/or  
10 carry 20 pounds and can frequently lift and/or carry 10 pounds.<sup>21</sup> He can also stand  
11 and/or walk with normal breaks for a total of about six hours in an eight-hour  
12 workday, and can sit with normal breaks for the same.<sup>22</sup> He would need to  
13 periodically alternate standing with sitting, and can frequently climb ramps and  
14 stairs.<sup>23</sup> He could also occasionally climb ladders, ropes, and scaffolds, as well as  
15 stoop, kneel, crouch, and crawl.<sup>24</sup> The ALJ noted that he should avoid concentrated  
16 exposure to extreme cold, vibration, and hazards such as dangerous machinery and  
17 unprotected heights.<sup>25</sup>

18  
19 The ALJ also found that Plaintiff is capable of unskilled, simple work tasks  
20 and well-learned detailed tasks with customary breaks and lunch.<sup>26</sup> He can have  
21

---

22  
23 <sup>18</sup> *Id.*

<sup>19</sup> *Id.*

<sup>20</sup> AR 26.

24 <sup>21</sup> *Id.*

<sup>22</sup> *Id.*

25 <sup>23</sup> *Id.*

<sup>24</sup> *Id.*

26 <sup>25</sup> AR 26.

<sup>26</sup> AR 27.

1 superficial interaction with coworkers, and there can be occasional material changes  
2 to the work environment.<sup>27</sup> The ALJ noted he may be off task about ten percent over  
3 the course of an eight-hour workday.<sup>28</sup>

4 In reaching these conclusions, the ALJ found that Plaintiff's medically  
5 determinable impairments could reasonably be expected to cause the alleged  
6 symptoms.<sup>29</sup> However, the ALJ stated Plaintiff's statements regarding the intensity,  
7 persistence and limiting effects of those symptoms were not entirely consistent with  
8 the evidence presented in the record.<sup>30</sup>

9  
10 When determining Plaintiff's RFC, the ALJ gave great weight to Dr. Olegario  
11 Ignacio, who provided a Disability Determination Explanation, as well as the DDS  
12 opinions of Dr. Leslie Postovoit and Dr. Patricia Kraft.<sup>31</sup> He assigned little weight to  
13 the report from Deloros Conrad, LICSW, and partial weight to the opinion of  
14 Plaintiff's mother.<sup>32</sup> Finally, the ALJ assigned little to no weight to the VA's  
15 disability determination.<sup>33</sup>

16  
17 At step five, the ALJ found Plaintiff was not able to perform any past relevant  
18 work, including his experience as a procurement clerk and school bus driver.<sup>34</sup>  
19 However, given his age, education, work experience, and RFC, the ALJ found that  
20 there exist significant numbers of jobs that Plaintiff may perform.<sup>35</sup>

---

21  
22  
23 <sup>27</sup> *Id.*

24 <sup>28</sup> *Id.*

25 <sup>29</sup> AR 28.

26 <sup>30</sup> *Id.*

<sup>31</sup> AR 32–33.

<sup>32</sup> AR 33–34.

<sup>33</sup> AR 34–35.

<sup>34</sup> AR 35.

<sup>35</sup> AR 36.

1 The ALJ issued its decision to deny Plaintiff benefits on June 27, 2016.<sup>36</sup> The  
2 Appeals Council denied Plaintiff's request for review,<sup>37</sup> making the ALJ's decision  
3 the Commissioner's final decision for the purposes of judicial review.<sup>38</sup> Plaintiff filed  
4 this lawsuit on January 5, 2018.<sup>39</sup>

### 6 III. Applicable Law & Analysis

#### 7 A. The ALJ did not provide persuasive, specific, and valid reasons to 8 discount the VA's disability determination.

9 Plaintiff argues that the ALJ erred in assigning "little to no weight" to the  
10 VA's determination that Plaintiff was 100% disabled, and that the ALJ failed to cite  
11 persuasive and specific reasons to discount the determination.<sup>40</sup> He states that the  
12 VA's finding was supported "by several hundred pages of medical records."<sup>41</sup>  
13 Defendant argues that the ALJ's reasons were specific, valid, and supported by the  
14 record because he stated differences between VA and SSA disability  
15 determinations.<sup>42</sup>

17 The VA's disability determination is not binding on an ALJ.<sup>43</sup> However, an  
18 ALJ must "ordinarily give great weight to a VA determination of disability."<sup>44</sup> 45 The

---

20 <sup>36</sup> AR 37.

21 <sup>37</sup> AR 1–3.

22 <sup>38</sup> See 42 U.S.C. § 1383(c)(3); 20 C.F.R. §§ 416.1481, 422.210.

23 <sup>39</sup> ECF No. 1.

24 <sup>40</sup> ECF No. 15 at 8–9.

25 <sup>41</sup> *Id.*

26 <sup>42</sup> ECF 19 at 15–18.

<sup>43</sup> 20 C.F.R. § 404.1504.

<sup>44</sup> *McCartey v. Massanari*, 298 F.3d 1072, 1076 (9th Cir. 2002).

<sup>45</sup> The Court notes that 20 C.F.R. § 404.1504 has been amended in March, 2017 to read as follows:  
"[I]n claims filed . . . on or after March 27, 2017, we will not provide any analysis in our  
determination or decision about a decision made by any other governmental agency . . . about  
whether you are disabled . . . or entitled to benefits. However, we will consider all of the supporting  
evidence underlying the other governmental agency . . . decision that we receive as evidence in

1 ALJ may assign less weight to the determination if he gives “persuasive, specific,  
2 valid reasons for doing so that are supported by the record.”<sup>46</sup> An ALJ’s rejection of  
3 a VA disability rating “on the general ground that the VA and SSA disability  
4 inquiries are different” is not a valid reason.<sup>47</sup>

5  
6 On July 1, 2014, the VA issued a disability determination of 100% from  
7 October 23, 2013 onward.<sup>48</sup> The ALJ discounted this determination, and after  
8 reciting several differences between the VA and SSA disability determinations, gave  
9 only the following explanation:

10 Although they provided a basis for their determination, the  
11 VA did not provide an individualized assessment that  
12 focuses on a claimant’s ability to perform work in the  
13 national economy. Thus, I assign these numeric ratings  
14 little to no weight.<sup>49</sup>

15 This Court has previously found nearly identical language to be “little more  
16 than generalized critiques,” and insufficient to show persuasive, valid reasons for  
17 refusing to afford great weight to the determination.<sup>50</sup> Instead, this comparison  
18 merely and impermissibly distinguishes the VA determination from the SSA.<sup>51</sup>

19  
20  
21  
22 your claim . . .” *See also* 20 C.F.R. § 416.904. However, because Plaintiff’s claim was filed prior to  
23 March 27, 2017, the ALJ was required to follow applicable regulations and precedent as stated.

<sup>46</sup> *McCartey*, 298 F.3d at 1076.

<sup>47</sup> *Valentine v. Comm’r of Social Sec. Admin.*, 574 F.3d 685, 695 (9th Cir. 2009).

<sup>48</sup> AR 709.

<sup>49</sup> AR 35. The Court additionally notes that the ALJ did consider the VA medical records  
25 accompanying the disability determination. *Id.*

<sup>50</sup> *See Parker v. Comm’r of Social Sec. Admin.*, No. 2:16-cv-0087-SMJ, 2017 WL 4158617 at \*7–8  
26 (E.D. Wash. Sep. 19, 2017).

<sup>51</sup> *Valentine*, 574 F.3d at 695.

1 The Court cannot conclude that this error is harmless, therefore the Court  
2 remands for additional proceedings.<sup>52</sup> The VA determination may have been an  
3 important factor in determining Plaintiff's RFC, therefore further administrative  
4 proceedings are required to fully develop the record.<sup>53</sup> Because the Court cannot say  
5 with certainty that no reasonable ALJ could reach a different conclusion if this  
6 evidence were considered,<sup>54</sup> the Court instructs the ALJ to reconsider the VA  
7 disability determination on remand.  
8

9 **B. The ALJ must evaluate Plaintiff's subjective symptom statements and**  
10 **medical and non-medical providers on remand.**

11 The evaluation of a claimant's symptom statements and their resulting  
12 limitations relies, in part, on the assessment of medical evidence, as well as the  
13 opinions of medical and non-medical sources.<sup>55</sup> Therefore, in light of a remand for  
14 the ALJ to address the VA disability determination, the ALJ should conduct a new  
15 assessment of Plaintiff's subjective symptom statements and of the opinions of  
16 Plaintiff's medical or non-medical sources when determining Plaintiff's RFC. The  
17 Court therefore declines to rule on the remaining issues Plaintiff raises at this time.  
18  
19

20 **IV. Conclusion**

21 The ALJ improperly discounted the VA's disability determination. Thus, for  
22 the reasons discussed above, the Court reverses the ALJ's decision and remands for  
23

---

24 <sup>52</sup> See *Treichler v. Comm'r of Social Sec. Admin.*, 775 F.3d 1090, 1099–1102 (9th Cir. 2014) (absent  
rare circumstances, remand for additional proceedings is appropriate in the instance of harmful  
error).

25 <sup>53</sup> See *id.* at 1101 (where “not all essential factual issues have been resolved, a remand for an award  
of benefits is inappropriate”) (citations omitted).

26 <sup>54</sup> See *Marsh*, 792 F.3d at 1173.

<sup>55</sup> 20 C.F.R. § 404.1529(c).



1 the ALJ to reconsider the VA disability determination and conduct any additional  
2 proceedings, including further development of the record, as he sees fit.

3 Accordingly, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:**

- 4 1. Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment, **ECF No. 15**, is **GRANTED**.  
5  
6 2. The Commissioner's Motion for Summary Judgment, **ECF No. 19**, is  
7 **DENIED**.  
8  
9 3. This case is **REMANDED** to the Commissioner of Social Security  
10 pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) for further proceedings consistent with  
11 this Order.  
12  
13 4. **JUDGMENT** is to be entered in the Plaintiff's favor.  
14  
15 5. The case shall be **CLOSED**.

16 **IT IS SO ORDERED.** The Clerk's Office is directed to enter this Order and  
17 provide copies to all counsel.

18 **DATED** this 1<sup>st</sup> day of March 2019.

19 s/Edward F. Shea  
20 EDWARD F. SHEA  
21 Senior United States District Judge  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26